

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 29 2006

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

First Named Applicant: Kimble)	Art Unit: 2174
)	
Serial No.: 09/775,692)	Examiner: Ke
)	
Filed: February 2, 2001)	50N3463.01
)	
For: WEB BROWSER PLUG-IN FOR TV)	August 29, 2006
)	750 B STREET, Suite 3120
)	San Diego, CA 92101
)	

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Commissioner for Patents
Alexandria, VA

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated August 14, 2006, the following remarks are submitted. Claims 1-22 and 24-30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Anderson et al., USPN 6,219,042 in view of Gerba, USPN 6,445,398, relying on the picture-in-graphics (PIG) teaching of Gerba at col. 27, lines 5-20 to provide a teaching of a transparent section, admittedly missing in Anderson et al. Also, Claim 23 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. in view of Gerba and Houghton et al., USPN 6,757,707.

The rejections are respectfully traversed.

The reason that Gerba uses the relied-upon transparent portion (essentially, a transparent portion of program guide) to display video in is to allow viewing of a program at the same time the title appears on the program guide, Gerba. col. 27, lines 5-15. Anderson et al., however, is directed to viewing a TV pane in

1168-176.AMD